IFW

AF

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the below date:

Date: May 17, 2005 Name: Steven P. Shurtz Signature: /Steven P. Shurtz/

BRINKS HOFER GILSON &LIONE

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Appln. of: Sonya S. Johnson et al.

Appln. No.: 10/024,631 Examiner: A. Corbin

Filed: December 17, 2001 Art Unit: 1761

For: COATED CHEWING GUM PRODUCT AND METHOD OF MAKING (as amended)

Attorney Docket No: 31,424

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL

Sir:

Attached is/are:

☒ Appeal Brief.

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Fee calculation:

☐ No additional fee is required.

☐ Small Entity.

☐ An extension fee in an amount of $_____ for a _____-month extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

☒ A petition or processing fee in an amount of $500.00 under 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2).

☐ An additional filing fee has been calculated as shown below:

						Small Entity			Not a Small Entity	
	Claims Remaining After Amendment		Highest No. Previously Paid For	Present Extra		Rate	Add'l Fee	or	Rate	Add'l Fee
Total		Minus				x $25=			x $50=	
Indep.		Minus				x 100=			x $200=	
First Presentation of Multiple Dep. Claim						+$180=			+ $360=	
						Total	$		Total	$

Fee payment:

☐ A check in the amount of $_____ is enclosed.

☐ Please charge Deposit Account No. 23-1925 in the amount of $. A copy of this Transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

☒ Payment by credit card in the amount of $500.00 (Form PTO-2038 is attached).

☒ The Director is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional filing fees required under 37 CFR § 1.16 and any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR § 1.17 associated with this paper (including any extension fee required to ensure that this paper is timely filed), or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-1925.

Respectfully submitted,

May 17, 2005
Date

/Steven P. Shurtz/
Steven P. Shurtz (Reg. No. 31,424)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope, with sufficient postage, addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313, on

May 17, 2005
Date of Deposit

Steven P. Shurtz, Reg. No. 31,424
Name of Applicant, Assignee or Registered Representative

/Steven P. Shurtz/
Signature

May 17, 2005
Date of Signature

Our Case No.: 1391/1532

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Sonya S. Johnson et al.

Serial No.: 10/024,631

Filing Date: December 17, 2001

For: COATED CHEWING GUM PRODUCT AND METHOD OF MAKING (as amended)

Examiner: A. Corbin

Group Art Unit No.: 1761

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This is an appeal from the Final Rejection dated December 14, 2004 of claims 1-22 and 25-38, all the claims pending in the above captioned case.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The present application is owned by the Wm. Wrigley Jr. Company.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related Appeals and Interferences for this case.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-22 and 25-38 are pending. Claims 22-24 and 39 were previously cancelled. Claims 1-22 and 25-38 were all rejected, and are all being appealed. No claims have been allowed.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

All previously filed amendments have been entered. No amendments have been filed since the Final Rejection.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The claimed invention relates to the composition of, and methods of producing, a coated chewing gum product containing an effective amount of a medicament. The inventive composition accelerates the absorption of the medicament through the oral mucosa.

It is of course known to provide active medicaments to individuals for various purposes. These medicaments can be used to treat diseases and as such are typically referred to as drugs or medicaments. Likewise, the drugs or medicaments can be used for preventive purposes, enhancing performance or maintaining health. There are a great variety of such medicaments. These medicaments run the gamut from stimulants such as caffeine to drugs such as analgesics, tranquilizers, and cardiovascular products, as well as vitamins, minerals, and supplements. Some such medicaments are taken on an "as-needed" basis while other medicaments must be taken at regular intervals by the individual. Specification, page 2, lines 3-13.

Typically, drugs or medicaments are administered parenterally or enterally. Of course, parenteral administration is the administration of the drug intravenously directly into the blood stream. Enteral refers to the administration of the drug into the gastrointestinal tract. In either case, the goal of the drug administration is to move the drug from the site of administration towards the systemic circulation. Specification, page 2, lines 14-19.

Oral administration of drugs is by far the most common method of moving drugs towards systemic circulation. However, absorption after oral administration is confounded by numerous factors. Most orally administered drugs are in the form of tablets or capsules, which must be disintegrated or dissolved before absorption can occur. When a drug rapidly dissolves from a drug product and readily passes across membranes, absorption from most site administration tends to be complete. This is not always the case for drugs given orally. Before reaching the vena cava, the drug must move down the alimentary canal and pass through the gut wall and liver, which are common sites of drug metabolism. Thus, the drug may be metabolized before it can be measured in the general circulation. This cause of a decrease in drug input is called the first pass effect. A large number of drugs show low bioavailabilities owning to an extensive first pass metabolism. Bioavailability considerations are most often encountered for orally administered drugs. Differences in bioavailability can have profound clinical significance. Specification, page 2, line 20 to page 3, line 17.

Although parenteral administration does provide a method for eliminating a number of the variables that are present with oral administration, parenteral administration is not a preferable route. Typically parenteral administration requires the use of medical personnel and is just not warranted nor practical for the administration of most agents and drugs, e.g., analgesics. Even when required, parenteral administration is objectionable due to patient concerns including comfort, infection, etc., as well as the equipment and costs involved. Specification, page 3, lines 18-25.

It is known to incorporate medicaments into chewing gums for the purpose of providing an opportunity for the medicament to be absorbed through mucous membranes in the mouth. The prior art discloses chewing gum compositions containing orally administrable medicament capable of being absorbed through the buccal cavity. Such systems have the advantage that the medicament is absorbed directly into the bloodstream. Increasing the rate of this absorption would further enhance the benefit of delivering medicaments using chewing gum. Specification, page 3, line 26 to page 4, line 2.

Earlier patent applications owned by Applicants' assignee disclose such enhanced systems. It was earlier discovered that it is particularly advantageous to

formulate a medicinal gum product as a coated chewing gum with a pharmaceutical agent in the coating to overcome the tendency for the agent to be entrapped in the gum base. In the present invention it was found that the use of sodium bicarbonate in a chewing gum containing a medicament increased the buccal/lingual absorption of the medicament into the bloodstream by raising the pH of the oral cavity. Specification, page 4, lines 3-19, and page 5, lines 25-30.

In a first aspect, the invention includes a coated chewing gum product with absorption acceleration of a medicament, comprising:

a) a chewing gum center comprising a gum base, a flavor, and a bulking/sweetening agent;

b) a chewing gum coating comprising a polyol selected from the group consisting of xylitol and sorbitol, and containing at least one medicament; and

c) a bicarbonate salt incorporated into the chewing gum center, the coating, or both. See claim 1.

In a second aspect, the invention includes a coated chewing gum product including a medicament comprising:

a) a chewing gum center;

b) a chewing gum coating containing at least one medicament and a polyol selected from the group consisting of xylitol and sorbitol; and

c) a bicarbonate salt incorporated into the chewing gum center, the coating, or both. See claim 16.

In a third aspect, the invention includes a method of delivering a medicament with accelerated absorption through the oral mucosa comprising the steps of:

a) providing a chewing gum center;

b) coating the chewing gum center with a coating comprising a polyol selected from the group consisting of xylitol and sorbitol, and containing at least one medicament;

c) either the chewing gum center, the coating, or both incorporating a bicarbonate salt; and

d) causing an individual in need of the medicament to chew the product. See claim 30.

In a fourth aspect, the invention includes a coated chewing gum product with absorption acceleration of caffeine, comprising:

a) a chewing gum center comprising a gum base, a flavor, and a bulking/sweetening agent;

b) a chewing gum coating comprising caffeine and a polyol selected from the group consisting of sorbitol and xylitol; and

c) a bicarbonate salt incorporated into the chewing gum center, the coating, or both. See claim 38.

In preferred embodiments, using xylitol or sorbitol as the coating material and adding 0.1% to 1% sodium bicarbonate to the center, or coating, of a chewing gum with a systemic drug in the coating, significant increases in absorption of the drug through oral mucosa can be achieved. The enhanced absorption due to the use of sorbitol or xylitol is an unexpected result. Specification, page 5, lines 6-10, and pages 27-31.

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

1. Claims 1-22, 25-27, 30-34 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,380,530 (Hill).
2. Claims 28, 29, 35, 36 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,487,902 (Anderson) and WO 98/23165 (Gudas). .

VII. ARGUMENT

A. Claims 1-22, 25-27, 30-34 and 37 are patentable over U. S. Patent No. 5,380,530 (Hill).

1. Claims 1-22, 25-27, 30-34 and 37

In the Final Rejection, claims 1-22, 25-27, 30-34 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,380,530 (Hill). The rejection is improper first because it treats the Hill reference as an anticipatory reference and second because not all of the elements of the rejected claims are disclosed in Hill. As

will be shown, the rejection should be predicated under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) instead of Section 102, because even though one reference is used, the claimed subject matter is not identically disclosed or described in the Hill reference. Thus, a Section 102 rejection is improper. Further, since the invention involves unexpected results, even if a *prima facia* rejection under Section 103 could be made out, that rejection would be overcome.

Claim 1 requires several things, including a coated chewing gum product, the chewing gum coating including a polyol selected from the group of sorbitol and xylitol, the coating also containing at least one medicament, and a bicarbonate salt incorporated into the chewing gum center, coating or both.

Hill discloses oral hygiene preparations, including coated chewing gum. However, the claimed invention is not identically disclosed. Hill teaches to use a special coating made from an emulsion containing an ingestible surfactant and a polydimethyl siloxane. The material is designed to disrupt dental plaque. Optionally the emulsion coating may contain a therapeutic substance. Hill goes on to suggest a myriad of possible materials that can be included in the emulsion coating. First, columns 15 and 16 list 18 lines of therapeutic substances, and groups of substances. Following that, Hill states, "Other substances which may also be included in the chewing gum base mixture and which may also be added to the emulsion coating include: non toxic sources for acid such as adipic acid in combination with calcined kaolin, calcium carbonate, sodium carbonate, sodium bicarbonate, various phosphates, dicalcium phosphate, tetra sodium pyrophosphate, lecithin, lanolin, hydrolysable tannin, silica and the like. (Col. 16, lines 6-13). It is thus clear that bicarbonate salt, required by claim 1 in the present case, is only one of a great many "other substances" that Hill suggests "may also be included." The specific polyols called for in the claims present another situation of picking and choosing (discussed below). This is certainly not a case where the claimed invention is "identically disclosed or described" in the prior art reference.

The case of *In re Arkley, Eardley, and Long*, 172 USPQ 524 (CCPA 1972) is directly on point. In *Arkley*, the Examiner made a rejection under Section 102. The claim at issue was to a compound of a new chemical formula. The prior art reference disclosed a generic class of compounds which included the claimed compound. In addition, two examples (4 and 10) in the cited prior art reference disclosed the precursor

of the claimed compound, and there was another teaching in the reference of a chemical reaction which, if applied to the precursor, would yield the claimed compound. However, there was not a direct teaching of applying that reaction to the specific precursor of the examples 4 and 10. Rather, the rejection relied on a statement elsewhere in the reference which arguably taught that the class of compounds would have superior antibacterial activity. Because the rejection was made under Section 102, the extensive objective evidence of non-obviousness was disregarded by the Examiner and the Board.

The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals reversed the rejection on Section 102 grounds, and the application went back to the Examiner for possible entry of a rejection based on Section 103. In making its decision, the court pointed out that the language of Section 103 states that "where the subject matter claimed 'is not *identically* disclosed or described' in 'the prior art'", then Section 103 is the proper statutory section for analysis of patentability. Id. at 526 (emphasis in original). The court went on to state, "for the instant rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) to have been proper, the Flynn reference must clearly and unequivocally disclose the claimed compound or direct those skilled in the art to the compound without *any* need for picking, choosing, and combining various disclosures not directly related to each other by the teachings of the cited reference. Such picking and choosing may be entirely proper in the making of a 103, obviousness rejection, ... but it has no place in the making of a 102, anticipation rejection." Id.(emphasis in original).

In the present rejection based on Hill, one has to pick and choose the various teachings of Hill to come up the claimed invention. As noted above, there is no specific teaching in Hill to include a medicament in an emulsion coating that also contains xylitol and/or sorbitol, and then provide in that same product a bicarbonate salt. In the first place, the therapeutic substance referred to in Hill is only an optional ingredient in the emulsion coating. Second, bicarbonate salt, required by claim 1 in the present case, is only one of a great many "other substances" that Hill suggests "may also be included."

Third, when it comes to the two sweeteners specified in claim 1, the reference again notes that sweeteners are optional, and lists a myriad of sweeteners that can be included in the emulsion. Col. 17, lines 7-11 state, "For example, natural and synthetic

flavor and sweetener agents as diverse as menthol, xylitol and glycyrrhizin are known to be beneficial towards plaque control and are included in the emulsion coating compositions of this invention." (Citing two articles.) After discussing other optional ingredients for another 19 lines in column 17, lines 34-39 states, "Additional adjutants[sic] can be added to the emulsion coatings to provide color, flavor, or sweetening effects, as desired. Examples of suitable sweetening agents include sorbitol, sodium cyclamate, saccharine, commercial materials such as NutraSweet® brand of aspartame and xylitol."

There are a full three columns of optional ingredients that can be used in the emulsion coating, listing dozens and dozens of different compounds. If one were to list all of the various combinations of the optional ingredients, the permutation of all of the different combinations would likely be millions, if not billions, of different combinations of ingredients suggested for use in the emulsion coating. Yet only a handful of these combinations would have all three of a medicament, sodium bicarbonate and xylitol and/or sorbitol as required by claim 1. Just as in *Arkley*, one has to pick and choose specific optional ingredients from numerous lists of ingredients to come up with all of the items required by claim 1. And, just as in *Arkley*, there are examples in Hill, but none of the examples teach the claimed combination. Nor is there anything in Hill that would make the claimed combination more likely to be used than any other possible combination of optional ingredients. Thus there is no "identical" disclosure of the invention of claim 1 in Hill as required for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Hence, just as in *Arkley*, the rejection based on Section 102 is not appropriate and must be overturned, because Hill does not identically disclose the invention of claim 1.

The Final Rejection takes the position that the rejection over Hill does not involve the type of picking and choosing that took place in *Arkley* because the selection of sodium bicarbonate is from a "limited number" of other substances, and the selection of xylitol or sorbitol is from a "limited number" of sweetening agents. This argument helps to highlight the thinking that lead to the improper rejection in the first place. One only gets to the point of choosing from a "limed number" of sweeteners and a "limited number" of "other substances" by hindsight of the present invention. There is nothing in Hill that suggests that when a medicament is included in the emulsion coating, one

should "clearly and unequivocally" include one of the "other substances" and a sweetener. According to Hill, these are all optional ingredients in the emulsion coating. There is no reason other than hindsight to include something from all three groups of optional ingredients. It is only after hindsight of the claimed invention that one would look at Hill and decide to add an optional "other substance" to the emulsion coating, and only then would one ever get around to choosing a bicarbonate salt out of the list of "other substances." Likewise, it is only by hindsight of the claimed invention that one would get to the point of deciding to include a sweetener in the emulsion coating, and then pick and choose xylitol or sorbitol. It is the picking of all three of these optional ingredients to include in an emulsion coating, and then selecting out of the optional ingredients those specifically listed in claim 1, that shows that this rejection is improper. The invention of claim 1 is not "identically disclosed" in Hill. Hill does not "clearly and unequivocally disclose the claimed compound or direct those skilled in the art to the compound without *any* need for picking, choosing, and combining various disclosures not directly related to each other by the teachings of the cited reference." This case is controlled by *Arkley,* and the Section 102 rejection must be reversed.

Claims 16 and 30 require the same three elements identified above with respect to claim 1. Thus these claims, and claims 2-15, 17-22, 25-27, 31-34 and 37 dependent on claims 1, 16 and 30, were improperly rejected under Section 102 over Hill.

During a conversation between the below signed attorney and Examiner Corbin on July 19, 2004, Examiner Corbin noted that the specification includes test results that show the nonobviousness of the claimed invention, and that is the reason why the case was previously allowed before the Hill reference was considered specifically. (Page 4, lines 25-28 of Applicants' response mailed October 29, 2004 recited this same discussion between Applicants' attorney and Examiner Corbin. The Final Rejection mailed December 14, 2004 does not contradict that this conversation took place.) In view of the foregoing, even if one could say that Hill, while not directly teaching the claimed invention, made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness, it is clear that the unexpected results (dramatically increased absorption of caffeine) shown by the test reported in the specification, would overcome such a rejection. As a minimum,

however, the 102 rejection over Hill must be reversed. If a proper Section 103 rejection is then made, the unexpected results of the invention can be properly addressed.

2. Further reasons why the claims are not anticipated

a. Claims 2, 18 and 31

Claims 2, 18 and 31 require the bicarbonate salt to comprise from about 0.1% to about 1% by weight of the chewing gum product. There is no suggestion in Hill of using a bicarbonate salt at this level.

b. Claim 4

Claim 4 requires sodium bicarbonate to comprise from about 0.2% to about 0.7% by weight of the chewing gum product. There is no suggestion in Hill of using sodium bicarbonate at this level.

c. Claim 9

Claim 9 requires the gum center to further comprise a cooling agent. There is no suggestion in Hill of using a cooling agent in the gum center.

d. Claims 14 and 15

Claims 14 and 15 require the bicarbonate salt to comprise sodium bicarbonate in the chewing gum center and that the coating comprises specifically either xylitol (claim 14) or sorbitol (claim 15). Coming up with these specific combinations would require even further picking and choosing of all the possible combinations in Hill. Further, these combinations were shown to have unexpected results compared to other sweeteners in the coating. Thus these claims are further patentable over Hill.

e. Claim 37

Claim 37 is a method claim that requires the medicament to be delivered at a rate greater than 30% more than the rate that the medicament would have been delivered if the bicarbonate salt were not present. There is no suggestion in Hill of generating greater absorption of the medicament by the inclusion of the bicarbonate salt.

B. Claims 28, 29, 35, 36 and 38 are patentable over Hill in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,487,902 (Anderson) and WO 98/23165 (Gudas).

In the Final Rejection, claims 28, 29, 35, 36 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,487,902 (Anderson) and WO 98/23165 (Gudas). Claims 28 and 35 are dependent on claims 16 and 30 respectively, and further add the limitation that the medicaments comprise an encapsulated medicament. Claims 29 and 36 are also dependent on claims 16 and 30 respectively, and require the medicament to comprise caffeine. Claim 38 is an independent claim. It requires the same three elements discussed above with respect to claim 1, but specifically calls for the use of caffeine in the coating rather than a medicament generically.

1. Claims 28 and 35

The Final Rejection takes the position that it would have been obvious to substitute caffeine for the benzocaine used in Hill, since both are known to be used as active agents in chewing gum, according to Anderson. The logic behind the rejection, however, is faulty, based on impermissible hindsight reconstruction of the invention. The reason that benzocaine and caffeine are suggested as alternative ingredients in Anderson has no relevance to Hill. Anderson discloses a type of solubilizer that should be included in a chewing gum composition to accelerate the release of active agents from the chewing gum. Hill discloses an emulsion coating on chewing gum to inhibit plaque adhesion to teeth. The two references have nothing in common except chewing gum is involved and benzocaine is suggested as a possible ingredient in both patents. Just because the caffeine and benzocaine may be alternatively used in Anderson is not a suggestion to use caffeine in place of benzocaine in Hill. Certainly there is no motivation from Anderson to use caffeine instead of benzocaine in the emulsion coating of Hill.

The Final Rejection argues that caffeine would be used if drowsiness prevention is desired. But there is no suggestion in Hill of adding a material to the emulsion coating to prevent drowsiness. By that logic, it would always be obvious to add any compound with a known benefit to another composition simply by asserting that it would be desirable to have the known benefit of that compound. This is not a proper basis for

an obviousness rejection. There must be some motivation from the prior art itself to combine the references, or make the substitution, before the references can be combined.

Further, as indicated above, the present invention involves unexpected results. The additional references do not suggest that the claimed combination would have such dramatic results with respect to buccal absorption as shown in the test data on pages 27-31 of the specification.

2. Claims 29, 36 and 38

Gudas teaches different ways of treating caffeine to control its release. However, there is nothing in Gudas, or the other cited references for that matter, that would suggest using an encapsulated caffeine material in the product of Hill. Further, as indicated above, the present invention involves unexpected results. The additional references do not suggest that the claimed combination would have such dramatic results with respect to buccal absorption.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Appellants have made a novel and nonobvious contribution to the art of accelerating the absorption of medicaments through the oral mucosa. The claims at issue distinguish over the cited references. The present invention is not anticipated by nor obvious in view the cited prior art. The references are being combined based solely on hindsight reconstruction of the invention. A person of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the references as suggested in the Final Rejection. Preferred aspects of the invention are not taught in, nor obvious from the cited references.

Appellants submit that the present invention is fully patentable over the cited references and the Examiner should be REVERSED.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven P. Shurtz/

Steven P. Shurtz
Registration No. 31,424
Attorney for Appellants

Dated: May 17, 2005
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
(312) 321-4200
Direct Dial: (801) 444-3933

APPENDIX A

CLAIMS ON APPEAL

1. A coated chewing gum product with absorption acceleration of a medicament, comprising:

a) a chewing gum center comprising a gum base, a flavor, and a bulking/sweetening agent;

b) a chewing gum coating comprising a polyol selected from the group consisting of xylitol and sorbitol, and containing at least one medicament; and

c) a bicarbonate salt incorporated into the chewing gum center, the coating, or both.

2. The coated chewing gum product of claim 1 wherein the bicarbonate salt comprises from about 0.1% to about 1% by weight of the chewing gum product.

3. The coated chewing gum product of claim 1 wherein said bicarbonate salt is sodium bicarbonate.

4. The coated chewing gum product of claim 3 wherein the amount of said sodium bicarbonate ranges from 0.2% to 0.7% by weight of the chewing gum product.

5. The coated chewing gum product of claim 3 wherein said sodium bicarbonate is in the chewing gum center.

6. The coated chewing gum product of claim 3 wherein said sodium bicarbonate is present in the coating.

7. The coated chewing gum product of claim 3 wherein said sodium bicarbonate is present in both the chewing gum center and the coating.

8. The coated chewing gum product of claim 1 wherein said bulking/sweetening agent comprises a high-intensity sweetener selected from the group consisting of aspartame, alitame, salts of acesulfame, cyclamate and its salts,

saccharine and its salts, neotame, thaumatin, monellin, dihydrochalcones, sucralose and combinations thereof.

9. The coated chewing gum product of claim 1 wherein said gum center further comprises a cooling agent.

10. The coated chewing gum product of claim 1 wherein said gum center further comprises a plasticizing agent.

11. The coated chewing gum product of claim 1 wherein said coating comprises at least one flavor.

12. The coated chewing gum product of claim 1 wherein said medicament comprises an orally administrable medicament selected from a group consisting of stimulants, vitamins, minerals, herbal supplements, neutraceuticals, nicotine, nicotine replacement agents, antacids, analgesics and combinations thereof.

13. The chewing gum product of claim 1 wherein said medicament comprises an orally administrable medicament selected from the group consisting of tranquilizers, cardiovascular agents, cancer therapeutics, anitmycotics, oral contraceptives, muscle relaxants, antihistamines, decongestants, antibacterial agents, anesthetics, antitussives, diuretics, anti-inflammatories, HIV medications, AIDS medications, neurological drugs, antivirals, psychotherapeutic agents, anti-diabetic agents and combinations thereof.

14. The coated chewing gum product of claim 1 wherein said chewing gum coating comprises xylitol and the bicarbonate salt comprises sodium bicarbonate incorporated into the chewing gum center.

15. The coated chewing gum product of claim 1 wherein said chewing gum coating comprises sorbitol and the bicarbonate salt comprises sodium bicarbonate incorporated into the chewing gum center.

16. A coated chewing gum product including a medicament comprising:

a) a chewing gum center;

b) a chewing gum coating containing at least one medicament and a polyol selected from the group consisting of xylitol and sorbitol; and

c) a bicarbonate salt incorporated into the chewing gum center, the coating, or both.

17. The coated chewing gum product of claim 16 wherein said bicarbonate salt is sodium bicarbonate.

18. The coated chewing gum product of claim 17 wherein the amount of said sodium bicarbonate ranges from 0.1% to 1% by weight of the entire product.

19. The coated chewing gum product of claim 16 wherein said bicarbonate salt is in the chewing gum center.

20. The coated chewing gum product of claim 16 wherein said bicarbonate salt is present in the coating.

21. The coated chewing gum product of claim 16 wherein said bicarbonate salt is present in both the chewing gum center and the coating.

22. The coated chewing gum product of claim 16 wherein said chewing gum center comprises a high-intensity sweetener selected from the group consisting of aspartame, alitame, salts of acesulfame, cyclamate and its salts, saccharine and its salts, neotame, thaumatin, monellin, dihydrochalcones, sucralose and combinations thereof.

25. The coated chewing gum product of claim 16 wherein said coating comprises least one flavor.

26. The chewing gum product of claim 16 wherein said medicament comprises an orally administrable medicament selected from a group consisting of stimulants, vitamins, minerals, herbal supplements, neutraceuticals, nicotine, nicotine replacement agents, antacids, analgesics and combinations thereof.

27. The chewing gum product of claim 16 wherein said medicament comprises an orally administrable medicament selected from the group consisting of tranquilizers, cardiovascular agents, cancer therapeutics, anitmycotics, oral contraceptives, muscle relaxants, antihistamines, decongestants, antibacterial agents, anesthetics, antitussives, diuretics, anti-inflammatories, HIV medications, AIDS medications, neurological drugs, antivirals, psychotherapeutic agents, anti-diabetic agents and combinations thereof.

28. The coated chewing gum product of claim 16 wherein said medicament comprises an encapsulated medicament.

29. The coated chewing gum product of claim 16 wherein said medicament comprises caffeine.

30. A method of delivering a medicament with accelerated absorption through the oral mucosa comprising the steps of:

a) providing a chewing gum center;

b) coating the chewing gum center with a coating comprising a polyol selected from the group consisting of xylitol and sorbitol, and containing at least one medicament;

c) either the chewing gum center, the coating, or both incorporating a bicarbonate salt; and

d) causing an individual in need of the medicament to chew the product.

31. The method of claim 30 wherein said bicarbonate salt is sodium bicarbonate.

32. The method of claim 31 wherein the amount of said sodium bicarbonate ranges from 0.1% to 1% by weight of the chewing gum product.

33. The method of claim 30 wherein said medicament comprises an orally administrable medicament selected chosen from a group consisting of stimulants,

vitamins, minerals, herbal supplements, neutraceuticals, nicotine, nicotine replacement agents, antacids, analgesics and combinations thereof.

34. The method of claim 30 wherein said medicament comprises an orally administrable medicament selected from the group consisting of tranquilizers; cardiovascular agents, cancer therapeutics, anitmycotics, oral contraceptives, muscle relaxants, antihistamines, decongestants, antibacterial agents, anesthetics, antitussives, diuretics, anti-inflammatories, HIV medications, AIDS medications, neurological drugs, antivirals, psychotherapeutic agents, anti-diabetic agents and combinations thereof.

35. The method of claim 30 wherein said medicament comprises an encapsulated medicament.

36. The method of claim 30 wherein said medicament comprises caffeine.

37. The method of claim 30 wherein the medicament is delivered at a rate greater than 30% more than the rate that the medicament would have been delivered if the bicarbonate salt were not present.

38. A coated chewing gum product with absorption acceleration of caffeine, comprising:

a) a chewing gum center comprising a gum base, a flavor, and a bulking/sweetening agent;

b) a chewing gum coating comprising caffeine and a polyol selected from the group consisting of sorbitol and xylitol; and

c) a bicarbonate salt incorporated into the chewing gum center, the coating, or both.